



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,130	01/16/2004	Masashi Otsuki	Q79054	5017
23373	7590	06/03/2005	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				NGUYEN, NGOC YEN M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1754		

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	OTSUKI ET AL.
10/758,130	
Examiner	Art Unit
Ngoc-Yen M. Nguyen	1754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2005.
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 13-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 13-18 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over JP 07-157307.

JP '307 discloses a process for producing high purity beta-type silicon carbide powder (note title). The organic compound used for producing the silicon carbide powder can be phenol resin, a nitrile resin, furan resin, polyimide resin, styrene resin, xylene resin, polyphenylene oxide, etc. (note paragraph [0090]). When the organic compound used is not phenol type resin, the product of JP '307 would inherently have low nitrogen content as required by the claimed invention.

The mean particle size of the silicon carbide product can be 185 microns (note Example A1.

The process limitations in the instant claims are noted. However, when the examiner has found a substantially similar product as in the applied prior art, the burden of proof is shifted to applicant to establish that their product is patentably distinct and not the examiner to show the same process of making. *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685 and *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324.

JP '307 does not specifically the use of "resol xylene resin", however, since the use of "xylene resin" is desirable, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any suitable type of xylene resin in order to produce the silicon carbide product.

The difference not yet discussed is JP '307 does not disclose the particle size distribution.

However, the silicon carbide powder of JP '307 is used for the production of silicon carbide single crystals (note title).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the particle size distribution for the product of JP '307 in order to obtain the most suitable starting material for making single crystal silicon carbide.

Applicant's arguments filed March 11, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the norvolac xylene resin, as used in JP '307 has small amounts of reactive substituents and when the silicon source and the norvolac xylene resin cannot be mixed uniformly. As a result, phase separation occurs and the silicon carbide powder has a lower degree of purity as compared to when resol xylene resin was used.

This argument is noted however; mere attorney's argument is given little weight. There is no sufficient evidence on record to show that the use of resol xylene resin is critical and such use would give an unexpected result for the silicon carbide product or

to show that the silicon carbide produced by using resol xylene resin is different than the silicon carbide produced by using norvolac xylene resin.

Applicant's submission of the requirements for the joint research agreement prior art exclusion under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) on March 11, 2005 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection under 37 CFR 1.109(b) presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.02(I)(3). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ngoc-Yen M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1356. The examiner is currently on Part time schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Stan Silverman can be reached on (571) 272-1358. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed (571) 272-1700.

Ngoc-Yen Nguyen
Ngoc-Yen M. Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1754

nmm
May 31, 2005